STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD DIVISION OF WATER QUALITY P.O. BOX 100 SACRAMENTO, CA 95812-0100

Environmental Checklist

I. Background

Project Title: Statewide Policy on Compliance Schedules in National Pollutant

Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits

Contact Person: Frank Roddy

Staff Environmental Scientist Division of Water Quality

P.O. Box 100

Sacramento, CA 95812-0100 Phone: (916) 341-5379

e-mail: froddy@waterboards.ca.gov

Project Description: Adoption of a statewide policy on compliance schedules to be included in NPDES permits. The proposed policy will supersede compliance schedule provisions in all regional and statewide plans and policies, with the exception of the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (SIP), and provide consistency statewide for the adoption of compliance schedules into NPDES permits. The proposed policy includes the following provisions:

- Restricts the duration of a compliance schedule to five years after the inclusion of the compliance schedule into the NPDES permit, not to exceed the term of the NPDES permit; with the possibility of a five year extension (not to exceed two permit terms) if unforeseen circumstances beyond the control of the discharger arise.
- Restricts the duration of a NPDES compliance schedule to no more than ten years after the adoption, revision, or new interpretation of applicable standards.
- Allows additional time to comply with NPDES permit limitations that are based on a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).
- Defines "new" and "existing" discharger based on the SIP definitions.
- Compliance schedules would only be authorized for NPDES permit limitations that are based on water quality standards that are <u>adopted or revised</u> after the effective date of the proposed policy with the exception that the effective dates currently contained in those basin plans that authorize compliance schedules shall apply instead in those regions.

- Does not authorize compliance schedules for NPDES permit limitations implementing prohibitions after the effective dates outlined above.
- Specifies application requirements based on a combination of all of the existing Regional Water Board requirements.
- Specifies permit requirements based on the SIP provisions, but requires that the entire schedule be included as enforceable permit terms.

II. Environmental Impacts

The environmental factors checked below could be potentially affected by this project. See the checklist on the following pages for more details.

	Land Use and Planning		Transportation/Circulation			Public Services	
	Population and Housing		Biological Resources			Utilities and Service	Systems
	Geological Problems /Soils		Energy and Mineral Resources	:		Aesthetics	
	Hydrology/Water Quality		Hazards			Cultural Resources	
	Air Quality		Noise			Recreation	
	Agriculture Resources		Mandatory Findings of Signifi	cance			
1.	AESTHETICS. Would the	ne proj	ect:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect	on a sce	nic vista?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
b)	Substantially damage scenic reso trees, rock outcroppings, and hist highway?						\square
c)	Substantially degrade the existing site and its surroundings?	g visual c	character or quality of the				
d)	Create a new source of substantia adversely affect day or nighttime						Ø
2.	AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental impacts, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:						
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Statewide Importance (Farmland pursuant to the Farmland Mappir California Resources Agency, to), as shov ig & Moi	wn on the maps prepared nitoring Program of the				V
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for Act contract?	agricultu	ıral use, or a Williamson				
c)	Involve other changes in the exis their location or nature, could res non-agricultural use?						\square

3.	AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?					
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?					
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				$\overline{\checkmark}$	
d)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				Ø	
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				$\overline{\checkmark}$	
4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the DFG or USFWS?					
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				Ø	
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, <i>etc.</i>) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?				Ø	
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				Ø	
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				$\overline{\checkmark}$	
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				Ø	
5.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				$\overline{\checkmark}$	
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?					
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				V	
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				$\overline{\checkmark}$	

5.	GEOLOGY and SOILS. Would the project:			
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			$\overline{\checkmark}$
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated in the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines & Geology Special Publication 42.			V
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$
	iv) Landslides?			$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			$\overline{\checkmark}$
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			Ø
d)	Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			V
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			V
7.	HAZARDS and HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would	l the projec	et:	
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			V
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			$\overline{\checkmark}$
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?			$\overline{\checkmark}$
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment?			V
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			Ø
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			V
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			V
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$

3. HYDROLOGY and WATER QUALITY. Would the	project:			
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				\square
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				V
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or volume of surface runoff in a manner that would:				
i) result in flooding on- or off-site				\checkmark
 ii) create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater discharge 				$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$
iii) provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff				$\overline{\checkmark}$
iv) result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?				\checkmark
d) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				\checkmark
e) Place housing or other structures which would impede or re-direct flood flows within a 100-yr. flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				Ø
f) Would the change in the water volume and/or the pattern of seasonal flows in the affected watercourse result in:				
 i) a significant cumulative reduction in the water supply downstream of the diversion? 				
ii) a significant reduction in water supply, either on an annual or seasonal basis, to senior water right holders downstream of the diversion?				
iii) a significant reduction in the available aquatic habitat or riparian habitat for native species of plants and animals?				
iv) a significant change in seasonal water temperatures due to changes in the patterns of water flow in the stream?				$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$
v) a substantial increase or threat from invasive, non-native plants and wildlife				$\overline{\checkmark}$
g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				\square
i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				Ø
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project: a) Physically divide an established community?	П	П	П	

b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				\square
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				
10.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?				
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				
11.	NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a)	Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
b)	Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\square
12.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (<i>e.g.</i> , by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (<i>e.g.</i> , through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\square
13.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substate associated with the provision of new or physically altered construction of which could cause significant environm acceptable service rations, response times or other perfect public services:	ed governn ental impa	nental facil cts, in orde	ities, the r to mainta	
a)	Fire protection?				\checkmark
b)	Police protection?				$\overline{\checkmark}$

c)	Schools?			
d)	Parks?			
e)	Other public facilities?			\square
14.	RECREATION. Would the project:			
a)	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			Ø
b)	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			Ø
15.	TRANSPORTATION / CIRCULATION. Would the	project:		
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (<i>i.e.</i> , result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			V
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level-of-service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			V
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			Ø
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (<i>e.g.</i> , sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (<i>e.g.</i> , farm equipment)?			
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?			\square
g)	Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (<i>e.g.</i> , bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			Ø
16.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the pr	roject:		
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			Ø
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?			Ø
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?			V
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			✓
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			\square
	vironmental Checklist for the Statewide Policy Compliance Schedules in NPDES Permits		I	Page D-7

g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste?	ns			$\overline{\checkmark}$
17.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIF	ICANCE.			
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wi species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or anima community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare endangered plant or animal or eliminate important example major periods of California history or prehistory?	ldlife l e or			Ø
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" is that the incremental effects of a project are considerable who viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the eother current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.	means en ffects of			☑
c)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly indirectly?	or			
Pre	pared By:				
	nk Roddy I	 Date			
	ff Environmental Scientist	Jale			
Rev	viewed by:		 		
	n Harris, Chief I IDL Section	Oate		(Form updated 3	3/28/00)